



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III. — *Some Spartan Families under the Empire.*

BY JAMES M. PATON,

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

THE Spartan inscriptions are not in themselves a very interesting subject for study. Belonging for the most part to the time of the empire, they consist chiefly of lists of magistrates or the eulogies engraved on the bases of honorary statues, of which the erection seems to have been authorized by the city, while the expense was borne by the relatives of the distinguished man. Naturally in such inscriptions chronological indications are seldom found; for although the lists of magistrates are regularly dated by the names of the Patronymus Eponymus, but few of these can be placed with precise accuracy. In the first volume of the Corpus,¹ Boeckh gave a list of the Eponymi, and so far as his material allowed, endeavored to point out their succession and approximate time, and this work has been supplemented by Foucart in the notes to the Laconian inscriptions collected by Le Bas.² However, the chronology of the Spartan magistrates of the empire is still in a very uncertain condition, nor is it likely to be placed on a secure basis until our stock of inscriptions is very much increased. Perhaps something may be gained by a still further extension of the methods employed by Boeckh and Foucart, especially when their material is supplemented by new inscriptions, in some cases found outside of Laconia.

A starting-point in defining the time is furnished by the occasional mention of an emperor, while the succession of the Eponymi is sometimes determined by inscriptions containing the *cursus honorum* of distinguished Spartans with the year in which each office was held. Though such indi-

¹ C. I. G. I. p. 606.

² Le Bas, *Voy. Arch., Explic. des Inscr.*, Pt. II. p. 109.

cations as these must of course form the foundation of any chronology, they are applicable to a very small proportion of the inscriptions, and further help must be sought from the names occurring in the lists. As the father's name is regularly added, it is often possible to trace successive generations through these texts, and thus obtain at least a tolerable certainty as to their order. Such family groups have been indicated by both Boeckh and Foucart, and freely used by them in their study of the inscriptions, but it was no part of their work to combine these groups into more extensive family trees, nor was the material at their disposal sufficient for such a combination. Using their work as a basis and incorporating more recently discovered inscriptions, it seems possible to trace the history of some Spartan families through several generations, while these genealogies in turn may serve to throw some light upon the chronology. It is true this method is far from absolutely certain, and in some cases it is impossible to come to a positive decision. P. Aelius Alkandridas, the son of Damokratidas, is certainly closely connected with P. Aelius Damokratidas, son of Alkandridas,¹ but is he father or son of the latter? Such a question can only be answered by the aid of other names occurring in these inscriptions, and sometimes this help is lacking. Still, without resorting to violent conjectures it is possible to make quite extensive combinations, and when these are followed out through all the inscriptions, the results must tend to clear away some of the obscurities previously existing. It is my object in this paper to trace the history, or rather the genealogy, — for the account is only a bare list of names, — of two families, whose members seem to have been prominent in Sparta through several generations.

Of the first family, one branch is known to us through literature as well as through the monuments, and its history has been so thoroughly discussed by R. Weil,² that it is unnecessary to do more than briefly summarize his results, with some additions from inscriptions unknown to him. Plutarch³

¹ C. I. G. 1364 *a* and *b*.

² *Athen. Mittheil.* VI. p. 10.

³ Plut. *Anton.* 67.

tells us that after the battle of Actium, Eurykles the Laconian pursued Antonius in revenge for the death of his father Lachares, who had been executed by the triumvir on a charge of piracy. Evidently Augustus valued the assistance thus received, for Strabo¹ says that in his time Eurykles was the ruler of Laconia, and that the island of Kythera was part of his private possessions. His rule, however, led to complaints on the part of his subjects,² so that he lost the favor of the emperor before his death, while at the time Strabo wrote (not later than 19 A.D.), his son was evidently in disgrace. Thus much we are able to gather from the literature; for the remainder of our information we are indebted to the inscriptions. These show that C. Iulius Eurykles, the son of Lachares,³ had two sons, C. Iulius Deximachos,⁴ of whom only the name is known, and C. Iulius Lakon,⁵ who later obtained such favor with the emperor, that under Claudius he ruled Laconia.⁶ About 68 A.D. an inscription was erected on the Acropolis of Athens, in honor of C. Iulius Spartiatikos,⁷ whose father's name is not given, but who is high-priest of the divine emperors and their family, an office belonging to the family of Eurykles, as is shown by a later inscription.⁸ Weil had already suspected some relationship to Eurykles, and this is made almost certain by an inscription from Epidauros,⁹ which reads Γ. 'Ιούλιος Λάκωνος υἱὸς Σπαρτιατικός. There seems to be no trace of the descendants of Spartiatikos, but an inscription of Gythion¹⁰ mentions C. Iulius Eurykles Herklanos, son of C. Iulius Lakon, descendant (ἐκγονος) of Eurykles, 37th priest descended from the Dioscuri, etc. The same name probably occurred on a stone brought from Kythera and once forming part of the collection Nanni, but which seems now to have disappeared.¹¹ This inscription can be positively dated as not earlier than 116 A.D.,

¹ Strabo, pp. 363 and 366.

² Cf. Ioseph. *Antiq.* XVI. 10; *Bell. Iud.* I. 26, 4.

³ C. I. A. III. 801 b. ⁴ C. I. A. III. 801 a. ⁵ C. I. G. 1389.

⁶ *Coins of British Museum*, Peloponnesus, Pl. xxv. 12.

⁷ C. I. A. III. 805. ⁸ Le Bas-Foucart, II. 245 b.

⁹ Cavvadias, *Fouilles d'Epidaure*, No. 197. ¹⁰ Le Bas-Foucart, II. 245 b.

¹¹ C. I. G. 1306; Le Bas-Foucart, II. p. 130.

and may possibly be later than 117 A.D., as in it Trajan is called *θεός*. It has been usually assumed that this Eurykles Herklanos was grandson of the great Eurykles, and consequently son of Lakon and brother of Spartiatikos, but there seems a serious chronological difficulty in this view, involving as it does the supposition of only two generations covering a period of one hundred years, from the death of Eurykles in 15 A.D. to the end of the reign of Trajan. It seems, therefore, more probable that Lakon, son of Eurykles, had himself a son Lakon, who was the father of Eurykles Herklanos. The latter was evidently a prominent man, for he had been quaestor, tribune, praetor, legate of Hispania Baetica, and legate of the 3d legion, so that it is not improbable that his father had resided in Rome, and hence is not noticed in his native land.¹ The son of Eurykles Herklanos is probably the C. Iulius Lakon, who was Eponymus for the second time during the reign of Hadrian.² Here the family tree of Eurykles comes to an end, but certain other inscriptions make it clear that part of the honors, of which Herklanos was so proud, belonged to his family only through marriage, and that his branch is but part of a much larger stem.

We have seen that Herklanos is 37th priest in descent from the Dioscuri, and it is natural to seek some connection with the other priests of these deities. The clue seems to be furnished by an inscription,³ which has been often discussed. It is a list engraved under a relief representing the Dioscuri standing, one on each side of a xoanon-like female figure, and evidently contains the names of those who took part in the worship of these Spartan divinities. It belongs to a class of inscriptions which seems to precede the Roman period, or at least the time of the empire, for Roman *nomina* and *praenomina* are entirely lacking. For us the interest of the inscription is found in a group of five names, *Εὐρυβά-*

¹ That Eurykles was a person of importance at Rome, or at least well known there, seems clear from the fact that among the numerous names borne by Pliny's friend, Q. Pompeius Falco, as recorded in C. I. L. X. 6321, we find Iulius Eurykles Herklanos.

² C. I. G. 1347. ³ Le Bas-Foucart, II. 163 a, especially lines 2-5 and 11.

νασσα Σιδέκτα, Τυνδάρης Σιδέκτα ἱερεὺς, Δεξιμάχος Πρατόλα, Σιδέκτας Πρατόλα, and Πρατόλας Δεξιμάχου. Obviously we have here a family group, in which the names Sidektas, Pratolas, and Deximachos are hereditary, and which is closely connected with the worship of the Dioscuri; if, therefore, we find in the later inscriptions these same names among the hereditary priests of the Dioscuri, a direct connection may fairly be assumed. Now a son of Eurykles bore the name C. Iulius Deximachos, and in an inscription,¹ which must fall between 18 B.C. and 14 B.C., we hear of C. Iulius Deximachos, the son of Pratolaos. The inference that Eurykles married the daughter of this Deximachos is plain, and has already been made by Weil, nor is there anything improbable in the supposition that the father of Deximachos is the Πρατόλας Δεξιμάχου mentioned in line 11 of the inscription in Le Bas; at any rate, it can scarcely be doubted that he belonged to the same family. We have thus a complete genealogical tree extending from about the middle of the first century B.C. until the time of Hadrian; and while at this time the direct descendants of C. Iulius Deximachos disappear, the line can be carried further in a collateral branch.

Among the inscriptions of Epidauros there is a group² referring to the family of a certain T. Statilius Timokrates, the son of Lamprias. Statues appear to have been set up in honor of this man and almost all his relations, but the most important documents are those relating to the statues erected by Athens and Sparta in honor of his son, T. Statilius Lamprias, who died in early youth. The Athenian decrees enable us to date this event between 66 A.D. and 68 A.D., while the Spartan decree, which is unfortunately very poorly preserved, gives some valuable information as to the connection of this Argive family with Laconia. It appears from this that Timokrates married Timosthenis, the daughter of Diylos, a Lacedaemonian, that her brother Aristokrates lived in Sparta, and further that the daughter of Timokrates and Timosthenis, Pasichareia, married a Spartan, Pratolaos. With

¹ C. I. G. 1299.

² Cavvadias, *Fouilles d'Epidaure*, Nos. 202-211.

this information it is possible to restore an inscription,¹ of which Boeckh had an imperfect copy. It was on a monument erected to Memmia Timosthenis by her parents, P. Pratolas and Memmia Pasichareia. Boeckh read Pasikleia, but the text shows X, and the Epidaurian inscription makes the restoration certain. The only objection that can be urged is that the daughter of Statilius Timokrates ought to be Statilia and not Memmia Pasichareia. The Epidaurian inscriptions show, however, that Timokrates assumed the name T. Statilius after he had already attained some prominence. If now his daughter was married before this time, she would probably take the name of her husband's family. I have not found when a T. Statilius was active in Greece, but P. Memmius Regulus was governor of Achaia, Macedonia, and Moesia under Caligula and Claudius, and it does not seem a violent assumption that the father of Pratolas owed his *civitas* to him.

In an inscription² which probably dates from the time of Antoninus Pius, occurs the name of P. Memmius Pratolaos, son of Deximachos. The time agrees very well, and in this man it is easy to recognize the grandson of the husband of Pasichareia. That this family is descended from the same source as Iulius Deximachos becomes clear when we find³ that P. Memmius Deximachos, son of Pratolaos, is the 42d hereditary priest of the Dioscuri in Sparta. Evidently since the time of Eurykles Herklanos this priesthood had passed over to the younger branch. This priest had two sons, Mnason and Pratolaos, but with them the family seems to end. Another branch of this family held prominent offices in Sparta during the second century of our era, but their exact connection with those already discussed is not yet clear. [P. Memmius] Sidektas (again a name that occurs in the early list of the family) was Eponymus at the time of Hadrian's visit to Sparta⁴ (126 A.D. according to Dürre⁵), and he had a son, P. Memmius Damares,⁶ whose son, P. Memmius Pratolaos Aristokles, is mentioned in two inscriptions,⁷ which

¹ C. I. G. 1441; cf. Vol. I. p. 922. ² C. I. G. 1240. ³ C. I. G. 1340.

⁴ C. I. G. 1241.

⁵ Dürre, *Reisen d. Kaisers Hadrian*, p. 59.

⁶ C. I. G. 1352.

⁷ C. I. G. 1341, 1342.

cannot be earlier than the time of M. Aurelius. The period is clearly defined, but the relationship between P. Memmius Pratolaos, son of Deximachos, and his apparently somewhat older contemporary P. Memmius Sidektas, is nowhere indicated, unless Boeckh's restoration of a very fragmentary inscription¹ can be accepted, according to which Sidektas also is the son of Deximachos. The inscription, however, is far too mutilated to give any certainty to this reading, probable though it appears, so that I prefer to leave it out of account. Other members of this family seem to be Memmia Ageta, daughter of Pratolas,² Memmia Damokratia, wife of L. Volusenus Damares,³ Memmia Eurybanassa, wife of C. Iulius Seimedes,⁴ and Memmia Xenokratia, daughter of Deximachos,⁵ but so far as I can see, there is no clue to their exact position in the genealogy.

The other family is somewhat less complicated and the relationships less confused than in the one which has just been discussed. Plutarch⁶ tells a story of an embassy to Rome to protest against the tyranny of Eurykles, which was headed by a descendant of the great Brasidas. It is therefore not surprising that we meet with this name several times in the later inscriptions, nor that the Roman name of the family in which it occurs is Tiberius Claudius.⁷ In three inscriptions of the time of Hadrian,⁸ there appears a certain Ti. Claudius Harmoneikos, who is once called son of Pleistoxenos, and who is probably the father of the Pleistoxenos and Xenophanes, who appear in another inscription,⁹ which is referred on other grounds to the reign of Antoninus. Another Ti. Claudius Harmoneikos, son of Brasidas, appears in an inscription,¹⁰ which probably belongs to the early part of the reign of M. Aurelius. It seems almost certain therefore that Brasidas is a third son of the first Ti. Claudius Harmo-

¹ C. I. G. 1250.² C. I. G. 1437.³ C. I. G. 1438.⁴ C. I. G. 1372.⁵ C. I. G. 1439.⁶ Plut. *Apoph. Reg. et Imper.*, Aug. 14.⁷ Cf. Sueton. *Tib.* 6 for the connection of the Claudii with Laconia.⁸ C. I. G. 1346, 1347; Le Bas-Foucart, II. 173 a.⁹ C. I. G. 1249, IV.¹⁰ Le Bas-Foucart, II. 176.

neikos. This Ti. Claudius Brasidas, father of Harmoneikos, does not himself appear in any inscription, unless he is the Eponymus mentioned in C. I. G. 1259, or the Brasidas whose statue, with its inscribed base, is now in the Museum at Sparta.¹ He seems to have had three sons, Harmoneikos, Brasidas,² and Pratolaos.³ The latter had a daughter, Claudia Damostheneia,⁴ who married Ti. Claudius Eudamos,⁵ the son of Spartiatikos. This Spartiatikos is possibly the father of Chareision,⁶ and almost certainly the father of Ti. Claudius Aristoteles,⁷ who lived during the reign of Caracalla. Aristoteles married Julia Etymokledeia,⁸ the daughter of C. Iulius Agathokles, son of Hippothales.⁹ They had one daughter, Claudia Philokratia; but the names of women occur chiefly on funeral monuments or the dedications of statues, and I have not been able to follow this branch further.

The other branch, however, which is descended from Eudamos and Damostheneia, can be traced easily for more than one generation. Two daughters are known, Claudia Damastheneia,¹⁰ and Claudia Polla, the wife of Aristetas, and mother of Pomponia Kallistonike, whose long list of priestly offices is set forth in C. I. G. 1444. That in this family many priestly functions were hereditary was already clear from the inscription¹¹ in honor of the elder Damostheneia, but Kallistonike enjoys quite a different list of titles, and one of these gives a clue to the source of her dignities. She is priestess of the Dioscuri, and, as has been said, daughter of Pomponius Aristetas. This points to a family well known from an earlier group of inscriptions. Alkastos, son of Timokritos, was senator under Hadrian.¹² One of his sons, C. Pomponius Agis, is mentioned in a number of inscriptions,¹³ which can thus be dated as falling approximately in the reign of Anto-

¹ *Athen. Mittheil.* II. 363.

² C. I. G. 1329.

³ C. I. G. 1243, 1426; *Eph. Arch.* 1892, 19, 2.

⁴ *Eph. Arch.* 1892, 19, 2; C. I. G. 1446.

⁵ C. I. G. 1445.

⁶ C. I. G. 1409.

⁷ C. I. G. 1349, 1353.

⁸ C. I. G. 1448.

⁹ C. I. G. 1259, 1360.

¹⁰ C. I. G. 1445.

¹¹ C. I. G. 1446.

¹² C. I. G. 1241; Le Bas-Foucart, II. 173 a.

¹³ C. I. G. 1239, 1240, 1249 II., 1266.

ninus, and this emperor seems to be mentioned in an inscription¹ relating to another son of Alkastos, C. Pomponius Aristetas, who claims descent from Herakles and the Dioscuri. His son, C. Pomponius Alkastos, lived under M. Aurelius,² and it does not seem extravagant to see in the father of Pomponia Kallistonike a son of this Alkastos.

It remains to consider two inscriptions on bases found near Amyklai,³ which throw further light on the descendants of Claudius Pratolaos. The first is in honor of Pompeia Polla, daughter of Theoxenos, whose statue was erected by her *ἐκγονοί*, Ti. Claudius Aelius Pratolaos Damokratidas and Claudia Damostheneia. Sextus Pompeius Theoxenos is known from an inscription,⁴ which shows that he was honored by a statue erected at the expense of his three children, Sextus Pompeius Theoxenos, Menophanes, and Polla, who now herself receives the same honor. The second base contains the inscription relating to Ti. Claudius Pratolaos, son of Brasidas, to which reference has already been made. This statue also was set up by the city at the expense of his *παῖδες*, Ti. Claudius Aelius Pratolaos Damokratidas, who here adds to his name a long list of priestly titles, and Claudia Damostheneia. The obvious explanation is that the two children have erected the statues of their father and grandmother. Polla is therefore the wife of Ti. Claudius Brasidas and mother of Pratolaos, or else mother of the wife of Pratolaos. I prefer the latter, for we have seen that of the three sons of Brasidas one was named for his paternal grandfather, and one for his father, so that it is not unlikely that the third, according to a common Spartan custom, should be named for his maternal grandfather, and that Brasidas had married the daughter of a Pratolaos, perhaps one of the Memmii already discussed. If this is true, Polla must be the mother of the wife of Pratolaos.

There is, however, one apparent difficulty in considering Ti. Claudius Aelius Pratolaos Damokratidas as brother of the elder Claudia Damostheneia. It is found in the inscription⁵

¹ Le Bas-Foucart, II. 174.

² C. I. G. 1242, 1247, 1253, 1351.

³ *Eph. Arch.*, 1892, 19, 1, 2.

⁴ C. I. G. 1369.

⁵ C. I. G. 1446.

belonging to the statue of this very Claudia Damostheneia, daughter of Pratolaos, for here she is given all the titles, which in the new inscription belong to Pratolaos Damokratidas, while the expense is borne by her son, Ti. Claudius Pratolaos Damokratidas, son of Eudamos. Are, then, the first two statues erected by mother and son to the grandmother and the father of the former? This seems very hard to believe, for the Spartan inscriptions usually mark the relationship very carefully. The alternative seems to be that Ti. Claudius Aelius Pratolaos Damokratidas and Ti. Claudius Pratolaos Damokratidas are uncle and nephew; and I find in the presence of the Aelius in the former name an additional indication that the two are not identical. It can scarcely be a mere coincidence that in an inscription, which cannot well be earlier than M. Aurelius, we have mention of P. Aelius Alkandridas, son of Damokratidas, and in other inscriptions, which cannot be exactly dated, P. Aelius Damokratidas, son of Alkandridas. If this man is the father of the first-mentioned Alkandridas, it is quite possible that Ti. Claudius Aelius Pratolaos Damokratidas was the adopted son of Alkandridas, and that the nephew received his uncle's names without the additional gentile designation.

The limits originally assigned to this paper forbade any discussion of the scattered fragments of genealogies which may be traced in other Spartan inscriptions, and further study has not led me to believe that they would lend themselves to any such extensive reconstructions as have been possible in these two families. Nor until this material has been worked over, does it seem wise to complete the inquiry by applying the results already obtained to the determination of the succession of the Eponymi, although I hope at another time to show that something has been gained in this direction also.

NOTE. — In the following tables the results of this discussion are combined in the form of genealogical trees, in which those relationships, which, although very probable, yet lack the direct testimony of the inscriptions, are indicated by dots, while those which seem distinctly proved are shown by heavy lines.

TABLE II.

